



IN THE US PTO

Application number: 10/021,656

Applicant: Gary C. Johnson

Appn. Date: 12-12-2001

Art Unit: 3681

CONTENTS

CONTENTS – (2 duplicate packages, response to OA of; 6-28-05)

(1) New Matter Statement.

(2) ~~Substitute Oath~~ *supplemental*

del (3) Cover page of; *11* patents with drawings, *List of 213 differential patents.*

(4) Certificate Of Mailing.

(5) Transmittal Forms..

(6) Claims – 13 and 14(new), 4 pages and 1 cover sheet.

(7) Remarks (6 – pages).

(8) *EXCERPT of: MPEP 716.04, Long-Felt Need and...*



IN THE USPTO

APPN. NUMBER : 10/021,656
APPN. FILED : 12-12-2001
APPLICANT : GARY C. JOHNSON
TITLE : JOHNSON (P.A.C.T.) DIFFERENTIAL
Examiner : Dirk Wright
ART UNIT : 3681

NEW MATTER STATEMENT

Statement concerning New Matter:

With this statement I, Gary C. Johnson attest to and verify that there is no
“New Matter” contained in the enclosed amendments of; 6 - 28 - 05.

The Claims and the Specification, have nothing that can be construed as new
matter. The detailed description of the “drawing”, sustained the previous drawing
corrections that I had made. The enclosed detailed description of the “invention”,
is supported by the completed / corrected drawing and the newest claims; 13 and 14.
There is nothing mentioned in the claims that isn’t in the drawing (one figure).

signature

Gary C. Johnson

date

7-16-05



Patents > **2163.07 Amendments to Application Which Are Supported in the Original Description [R-1] - 2100 Patentability**

Go to MPEP - Table of Contents
browse before

note: for the examine

2163.07 Amendments to Application Which Are Supported in the Original Description [R-1] - 2100 Patentability

2163.07 Amendments to Application Which Are Supported in the Original Description [R-1]

Amendments to an application which are supported in the original description are NOT new matter.

I. REPHRASING

see; Inversely Proportional Rotation

Mere rephrasing of a passage does not constitute new matter. Accordingly, a rewording of a passage where the same meaning remains intact is permissible. *In re Anderson*, 471 F.2d 1237, 176 USPQ 331 (CCPA 1973). The mere inclusion of dictionary or art recognized definitions known at the time of filing an application would not be considered new matter. If there are multiple definitions for a term and a definition is added to the application, it must be clear from the application as filed that applicant intended a particular definition, in order to avoid an issue of new matter and/or lack of written description. See, e.g., *Schering Corp. v. Amgen, Inc.*, 222 F.3d 1347, 1352-53, 55 USPQ2d 1650, 1654 (Fed. Cir. 2000). In *Schering*, the original disclosure drawn to recombinant DNA molecules utilized the term "leukocyte interferon." Shortly after the filing date, a scientific committee abolished the term in favor of "IFN-(a)," since the latter term more specifically identified a particular polypeptide and since the committee found that leukocytes also produced other types of interferon. The court held that the subsequent amendment to the specification and claims substituting the term "IFN-(a)" for "leukocyte interferon" merely renamed the invention and did not constitute new matter. The claims were limited to cover only the interferon subtype coded for by the inventor's original deposits.

II. OBVIOUS ERRORS

An amendment to correct an obvious error does not constitute new matter where one skilled in the art would not only recognize the existence of error in the specification, but also the appropriate correction. *In re Oda*, 443 F.2d 1200, 170



United States Patent and Trademark Office

PATENTS

[Home](#) | [Site Index](#) | [Search](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Glossary](#) | [Guides](#) | [Contacts](#) | [eBusiness](#) | [eBiz alerts](#) | [News](#) | [Help](#)

Patents > 716.04 Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others [R-2] - 700 Examination of Applications

[Go to MPEP - Table of Contents](#)[browse before](#)

716.04 Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others [R-2] - 700 Examination of Applications

716.04 Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others [R-2]

> I. < THE CLAIMED INVENTION MUST SATISFY A LONG-FELT NEED WHICH WAS RECOGNIZED, PERSISTENT, AND NOT SOLVED BY OTHERS

Establishing long-felt need requires objective evidence that an art recognized problem existed in the art for a long period of time without solution. The relevance of long-felt need and the failure of others to the issue of obviousness depends on several factors. First, the need must have been a persistent one that was recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Gershon*, 372 F.2d 535, 539, 152 USPQ 602, 605 (CCPA 1967) ("Since the alleged problem in this case was first recognized by appellants, and others apparently have not yet become aware of its existence, it goes without saying that there could not possibly be any evidence of either a long felt need in the . . . art for a solution to a problem of dubious existence or failure of others skilled in the art who unsuccessfully attempted to solve a problem of which they were not aware."); *Orthopedic Equipment Co., Inc. v. All Orthopedic Appliances, Inc.*, 707 F.2d 1376, 217 USPQ 1281 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (Although the claimed invention achieved the desirable result of reducing inventories, there was no evidence of any prior unsuccessful attempts to do so.).

Second, the long-felt need must not have been satisfied by another before the invention by applicant. *Newell Companies v. Kenney Mfg. Co.*, 864 F.2d 757, 768, 9 USPQ2d 1417, 1426 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (Although at one time there was a long-felt need for a "do-it-yourself" window shade material which was adjustable without the use of tools, a prior art product fulfilled the need by using a scored plastic material which could be torn. "[O]nce another supplied the key element, there was no long-felt need or, indeed, a problem to be solved".)

Third, the invention must in fact satisfy the long-felt need. *In re Cavanagh*, 436 F.2d 491, 168 USPQ 466 (CCPA 1971).

> II. < LONG-FELT NEED IS MEASURED FROM THE DATE A PROBLEM IS IDENTIFIED AND EFFORTS ARE MADE TO SOLVE IT

Long-felt need is analyzed as of the date the problem is identified and articulated, and there is evidence of efforts to solve that problem, not as of the date of the most

See List of 213 limited-slip differentials, look also at locking differentials.

note: for the examiner

30 of 30



Go to **MPEP - Table of Contents**

browse before

note: for the examiner

706.03 Rejections Not Based on Prior Art - 700 Examination of Applications

706.03 Rejections Not Based on Prior Art

The primary object of the examination of an application is to determine whether or not the claims are patentable over the prior art. This consideration should not be relegated to a secondary position while undue emphasis is given to nonprior art or "technical" rejections. Effort in examining should be concentrated on truly essential matters, minimizing or eliminating effort on technical rejections which are not really critical. Where a major technical rejection is proper (e.g., lack of proper disclosure, undue breadth, utility, etc.) such rejection should be stated with a full development of the reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled with some stereotyped expression.

Rejections based on nonstatutory subject matter are explained in **MPEP § 706.03(a), § 2105, § 2106 - § 2106.02, and § 2107 - § 2107.02**. Rejections based on subject matter barred by the Atomic Energy Act are explained in **MPEP § 706.03(b)**. Rejections based on duplicate claims are addressed in **MPEP § 706.03(k)**, and double patenting rejections are addressed in **MPEP § 804**. See **MPEP § 706.03(o)** for rejections based on new matter. Foreign filing without a license is discussed in **MPEP § 706.03(s)**. Disclaimer, after interference or public use proceeding, *res judicata*, and reissue are explained in **MPEP § 706.03(u) to § 706.03(x)**. Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112 are discussed in **MPEP § 2161 - § 2174**. IF THE LANGUAGE IN THE FORM PARAGRAPHS IS INCORPORATED IN THE OFFICE ACTION TO STATE THE REJECTION, THERE WILL BE LESS CHANCE OF A MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION.

browse after

KEY: =online business system =fees =forms =help =laws/regulations =definition (glossary)

The Inventors Assistance Center is available to help you on patent matters. Send questions about USPTO programs and services to the USPTO Contact Center (UCC). You can suggest USPTO webpages or material you would like featured on this section by E-mail to the webmaster@uspto.gov. While we cannot promise to accommodate all requests, your suggestions will be considered and may lead to other improvements on the website.

USPTO PATENT FULL-TEXT AND IMAGE DATABASE

Home	Quick	Advanced	Pat Num	Help
Prev. List		Bottom	View Cart	

Searching 1976 to present...

Results of Search in 1976 to present db for:

"limited slip differentials": 213 patents.

Hits 201 through 213 out of 213

[Prev. 50 Hits](#)

[Jump To](#)

note: for the examiner

[Refine Search:](#) "limited slip differentials"

PAT. NO.	Title
201 4,205,735	Means for preventing one wheel spin out of automotive drive wheels
202 4,180,466	Method of lubrication of a controlled slip differential
203 4,154,487	System for controlling the torque transmitted to motor vehicle driving wheels by a differential gear
204 RE29,872	Differential gear mechanism
205 RE29,854	Limited slip differential with negligible bias under light load conditions
206 4,098,313	Traction device for vehicular wheels
207 4,064,632	Tire caliper
208 3,991,091	Organo tin compound
209 3,972,941	Chemical reaction products of polyisobutylene
210 3,972,243	Traction drive with a traction fluid containing gem-structured polar organo compound
211 3,964,346	Limited slip differential including conical pinion and side gears
212 3,958,464	Limited-slip differential
213 3,930,424	Multi-shell limited slip differential

Prev. List		Top	View Cart	
Home	Quick	Advanced	Pat Num	Help

16 of 30



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

17 of 30



5

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10 / 021, 656
	Filing Date	12 / 12 / 2001
	First Named Inventor	GARY C. JOHNSON
	Art Unit	3681
	Examiner Name	Dirk Wright
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC)
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks (1) New Matter Statement (2) Substitute Oath (PTO/SB/04) (3) 6 patent drawings (cover page) (4) Certificate of Mailing (5) Transmittal Form (6) Claims 13 and 14, (4 pages) (7) Remarks (6 pages)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm or Individual name	Gary C. Johnson	
Signature	Gary C. Johnson	
Date	7-16-05	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.		
Typed or printed name	GARY C. JOHNSON	
Signature	Gary C. Johnson	Date 7-16-05

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.